

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,229	07/02/2003		Kevin W. HARRIS	07298.0048.CNUS01	1228
28694	7590	09/09/2004		EXAM	AMINER
TRACY W		•	NEWHOUSE, NA	THAN JEFFREY	
1496 EVAN MCLEAN,				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WCCD21111, V11 22101				3727	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
•	10/604,229	HARRIS, KEVIN W.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Nathan J. Newhouse	3727					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		orrespondence address					
Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 No	ovember 2003.						
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	wn from consideration.						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		Fyaminer					
	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application of the second state of the second s	ion No ed in this National Stage					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
<ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)         Paper No(s)/Mail Date     </li> </ol>		Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 3727

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant is advised that should claims 14-15 be found allowable, claims 22-23 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is rejected as there is no attachment to the vehicle as the securement member is not positively claimed, only that the spanning member is "configured to accept a securement member".

Claim 1 is further rejected as being unclear with respect to the limitation "...at least one of said connecting members adapted to accommodate fixation of a spanning member...". It is unclear how only one connecting member can be connected with the spanning member and the vehicle cargo arrangement still function.

Art Unit: 3727

Claim 2 is rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has only set forth a moveable securement member.

Claim 3 is rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has only set forth a stationary securement member.

Claim 4 is rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 6 is rejected as "said movable spanning member" and "said stationary spanning member" have no antecedent basis. Claim 6 is further rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 9 is further rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 10 is further rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 12 is rejected as being in conflict with claim 1 from which this claim depends. It is unclear how this add-on adaptor relates to the connecting members of claim 1 which receive the spanning member.

Claim 16 is further rejected as "said securement member" (in lines 11-12 and lines 14-15) is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 16 is further rejected as being unclear with respect to the limitation "... at least one of said connecting members adapted to accommodate fixation of a spanning

Art Unit: 3727

member...". It is unclear how only one connecting member can be connected with the spanning member and the vehicle cargo arrangement still function.

Claim 17 is further rejected as being unclear with respect to the limitation "... at least one of said connecting members adapted to accommodate fixation of a spanning member...". It is unclear how only one connecting member can be connected with the spanning member and the vehicle cargo arrangement still function. This is further confusing as applicant sets forth "both of said pair of spaced apart connecting members are adapted to accommodate fixation of said spanning member".

Claim 17 is rejected as "said moveable spanning member" and "said stationary spanning member" have no antecedent basis.

Claim 17 is rejected as "said securement member" in lines 10-11, 13-14 and 18 is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 18 is rejected as being unclear with respect to the limitation "... at least one of said connecting members adapted to accommodate fixation of a spanning member...". It is unclear how only one connecting member can be connected with the spanning member and the vehicle cargo arrangement still function. This is further confusing as applicant sets forth "both of said pair of spaced apart connecting members are adapted to accommodate fixation of said spanning member".

Claim 18 is rejected as "said securement member" in lines 10-11 and 13-14 is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Art Unit: 3727

Claim 19 is rejected as being unclear with respect to the limitation "... at least one of said connecting members adapted to accommodate fixation of a spanning member...". It is unclear how only one connecting member can be connected with the spanning member and the vehicle cargo arrangement still function. This is further confusing as applicant sets forth "both of said pair of spaced apart connecting members are adapted to accommodate fixation of said spanning member".

Claim 19 is rejected as "said securement member" in lines 10-11 and 13-14 is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 20 is rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

Claim 21 is rejected as "said securement member" is unclear as applicant has set forth two different securement members (stationary and moveable).

In view of the numerous rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, applicant should carefully review all of the claims to make sure there are no others.

- 4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 5. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 3727

In the independent claims 1, 16, 17, 18 and 19, applicant sets forth "... at least one of said connecting members adapted to accommodate fixation of a spanning member...". It is unclear how only one connecting member can be connected with the spanning member and the vehicle cargo arrangement still function. It is not clear if the vehicle cargo arrangement can function if it is only attached to one of the connecting members. Furthermore, there is no disclosure to this arrangement.

This is further confusing as applicant sets forth "both of said pair of spaced apart connecting members are adapted to accommodate fixation of said spanning member" in claims 17-19 as well as "at least one..." thereby adding confusion as to how many applicant is intending to claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that 6. form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 1-5, 11, 13, 16 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being 7. anticipated by Le Boeuf (Boeuf hereinafter).

Regarding claims 1 and 16, Boeuf discloses an anchor assembly comprising a pair of spaced apart connecting members (22) adapted to be attached to a cargo carrier body (see proximate lead line 15) and a spanning member (26) wherein at least one of the connecting members is adapted to "accommodate fixation of the spanning member"

Art Unit: 3727

and wherein the spanning member is "configured to accept" a securement member (see lead lines 27 and 28) as claimed. The carrier body in Boeuf is further adapted for engagement with a roof rack (see proximate lead lines 16-20) on the vehicle as claimed.

Regarding claims 2 and 16, see lead lines 27 and 28.

Regarding claims 3 and 16, see lead line 24 in Boeuf which is a stationary securement member and lead line 25 which defines a distal end adapted for securement to the vehicle.

Regarding claim 4, see lead lines 27 and 28.

Regarding claim 5 both of the connecting members are "adapted to accommodate fixation" of the spanning member as claimed.

Regarding claims 11, 13 and 22-23, see lead line 28.

### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 5,288,003	US 1,798,872
US 4,601,419	US 4,616,772
US 4,084,735	US 3,104,042
US 2,983,413	US 4,878,606
FR 1,228,920	FR 1,392,322

Art Unit: 3727

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan J. Newhouse whose telephone number is (703)-308-4158. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee W. Young can be reached on (703)-308-2572. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Mathan J. Newhouse Primary Examiner Art Unit 3727